# College Campus AC

“College is fun as long as you don't die.”  
~ Tsugumi Ohba, Death Note, Vol. 4: Love

The value of human freedom is a precondition to all other values, because the act of valuing itself presupposes freedom and thus principles of consistency necessitate reflexive endorsement. The sphere of the state is derived from the constitutive force of agreement from the general will of the population. Such conceptions stem from the natural value of human freedom.

#### Rousseau[[1]](#footnote-1)

I SUPPOSE men to have reached the point at which the obstacles in the way of their preservation in the state of nature show their power of resistance to be greater than the resources at the disposal of each individual for his maintenance in that state. That primitive condition can then subsist no longer; and **[Since] the human race** would perish unless it changed its manner of existence. But, as men cannot engender new forces, but [can] only **unite and direct existing [forces]** ones, they have no other **means of preserving themselves than the formation**, by aggregation, of a sum of forcesgreat enough to overcome the resistance. These they have to bring into play by means of a single motive power and cause to act in concert. This sum of forces can **arise only** where several persons **come together**: but, as the force and liberty of eachman **[person] are the chief instruments of** his **[their] self-preservation**, how can he pledge them without harming his own interests, and neglecting the care he owes to himself? This difficulty, in its bearing on my present subject, may be stated in the following terms: *"***The problem is to find a form of association** which will defend and protect with the whole common force the person and goods of each associate, and **in which each**, while uniting [themselves] himself with all, may still obey himself alone, and **remain[s] as free as before***."*This is the fundamental problem of which the *Social* *Contract* provides the solution. If then we discard from the social compact what is not of its essence, we shall find that it reduces itself to the following terms: "Each of us puts his person and all his **power in common** under the supreme direction of the **general will**, and, in our corporate capacity, **we receive** each member as an **indivisible part of thewhole**." At once, in place of the individual personality of each contracting party, **this act of association** creates a moral and collectivebody, composed of as many members as the assembly contains votes, and receiving from this act its unity, its common identity, its life and its will. This public person, so formed by the union of all other persons formerly took the name of city, and now takes that of Republic or *body**politic*; it is called by its members *State* when passive. *Sovereign* when active, and Power when compared with others like itself. Those who are associated in it take collectively the name of people, and severally are called citizens, as sharing in the sovereign power, and subjects, as being under the laws of the State. But these terms are often confused and taken one for another: it is enough to know how to distinguish them when they are being used with precision. This formula shows us that the act of association comprises a mutual undertaking between the public and the individuals, and that each individual, in making a contract, as we may say, with himself, is bound in a double capacity; as a member of the Sovereign he is bound to the individuals, and as a member of the State to the Sovereign. But the maxim of civil right, that no one is bound by undertakings made to himself, does not apply in this case; for there is a great difference between incurring an obligation to yourself and incurring one to a whole of which you form a part. *But the body politic or* **the Sovereign, drawing its** being wholly fromthe sanctity of **the contract, can** never bind itself, even to an outsider, to do **anything derogatory to the original act**, for instance, **to alienate any part of** itself, or to submit to another Sovereign. **Violation of the act by which it exists would be self-annihilation**; and that which is itself nothing can create nothing. In order then that the social compact may not be an empty formula, it tacitly includes the undertaking, which alone can give force to the rest, that **whoever refuses to obey the general will shall be compelled to do** so by the whole body. This means nothing less than that the will be forced to be free; for this is the condition which, by giving each citizen to his country, secures him against all personal dependence. In this lies the key to the working of the political machine; this **alone legitimizes civil undertakings,** which, without it, would be absurd, tyrannical, and liable to the most frightful abuse.

If the sovereign does not respect the general will, then they exert power over and above the citizenry and the contract dissolves since something other than the collective contract would govern state action.

#### Rousseau 2[[2]](#footnote-2)

I WARN the reader that this chapter requires careful reading, and that I am unable to make myself clear to those who refuse to be attentive. Every free action is produced by the concurrence of two causes; one moral, i.e., the will which determines the act; the other physical, i.e., the power which executes it. **When I walk** towards an object, **it is** necessary first that I should will **to** go there, and, in the second place, that my feet should carry **me**. If a paralytic wills to run and an active man wills not to, they will both stay where they are. **The body politic has the** same motive powers; here too force **and will are distinguished, will under** the name of legislative power and **force** under that of [the] executive power. Without their concurrencenothing is, or should be **done**. We have seen that the **legislative power belongs to the** people, and can belong to it alone. It may, on the other hand, readily be seen, from the principles laid down above, that the executive **power cannot belong to the generality** as legislature or Sovereign, **because it** consists wholly of **particular** acts which fall outside the competency of the law, and consequently of the Sovereign, whose acts must always be laws. The publicforce therefore needs **an agent of its own to bind it together and set it to work under the direction of the general will,** to serve as a means of communication between the State and the Sovereign, and to do for the collective person more or less what the union of soul and body does for man. Here wehave what is, in the State, the basis of government, often wrongly confused with the Sovereign, whose minister it is.What then is government? An intermediate body set up between the subjects and the Sovereign, to secure their mutual correspondence, charged with the execution of the laws and the maintenance of liberty, both civil and political. The members of this body are called magistrates or kings, that is to say governors, and the whole body bears the name prince.[18](http://www.constitution.org/jjr/socon_03.htm#18) Thus those who hold that the act, by which a people puts itself under a prince, is not a contract, are certainly right. It is simply and solely a commission, an employment, in which the rulers, mere officials of the Sovereign, exercise in their own name the power of which it makes them depositaries. This power it can limit, modify or recover at pleasure; for the alienation of such a right is incompatible with the nature of the social body, and contrary to the end of association. I call then government, or supreme administration, the legitimate exercise of the executive power, and prince or magistrate the man or the body entrusted with that administration. In government reside the intermediate forces whose relations make up that of the whole to the whole, or of the Sovereign to the State. This last relation may be represented as that between the extreme terms of a continuous proportion, which has government as its mean proportional. The government gets from the Sovereign the orders it gives the people, and, for the State to be properly balanced, there must, when everything is reckoned in, be equality between the product or power of the government taken in itself, and the product or power of the citizens, who are on the one hand sovereign and on the other subject. Furthermore, none of these three terms can be altered without the equality being instantly destroyed. If the Sovereign desires to govern, or the magistrate to give laws, or if the subjects refuse to obey, disorder takes the place of regularity, force and will no longer act together, and the State is dissolved and falls into despotism or anarchy. Lastly, as there is only one mean proportional between each relation, there is also only one good government possible for a State. But, as countless events may change the relations of a people, not only may different governments be good for different peoples, but also for the same people at different times. In attempting to give some idea of the various relations that may hold between these two extreme terms, I shall take as an example the number of a people, which is the most easily expressible. Suppose the State is composed of ten thousand citizens. The Sovereign can only be considered collectively and as a body; but each member, as being a subject, is regarded as an individual: thus the Sovereign is to the subject as ten thousand to one, i.e., each member of the State has as his share only a ten-thousandth part of the sovereign authority, although he is wholly under its control. If the people numbers a hundred thousand, the condition of the subject undergoes no change, and each equally is under the whole authority of the laws, while his vote, being reduced to a hundred-thousandth part, has ten times less influence in drawing them up. The subject therefore remaining always a unit, the relation between him and the Sovereign increases with the number of the citizens. From this it follows that, the larger the State, the less the liberty. When I say the relation increases, I mean that it grows more unequal. Thus the greater it is in the geometrical sense, the less relation there is in the ordinary sense of the word. In the former sense, the relation, considered according to quantity, is expressed by the quotient; in the latter, considered according to identity, it is reckoned by similarity. Now, the less relation the particular wills have to the general will, that is, morals and manners to laws, the more should the repressive force be increased. The government, then, to be good, should be proportionately stronger as the people is more numerous. On the other hand, as the growth of the State gives the depositaries of the public authority more temptations and chances of abusing their power, the greater the force with which the government ought to be endowed for keeping the people in hand, the greater too should be the force at the disposal of the Sovereign for keeping the government in hand. I am speaking, not of absolute force, but of the relative force of the different parts of the State. It follows from this double relation that the continuous proportion between the Sovereign, the prince and the people, is by no means an arbitrary idea, but a necessary consequence of the nature of the body politic. It follows further that, one of the extreme terms, viz., the people, as subject, being fixed and represented by unity, whenever the duplicate ratio increases or diminishes, the simple ratio does the same, and is changed accordingly. From this we see that there is not a single unique and absolute form of government, but as many governments differing in nature as there are States differing in size. If, ridiculing this system, any one were to say that, in order to find the mean proportional and give form to the body of the government, it is only necessary, according to me, to find the square root of the number of the people, I should answer that I am here taking this number only as an instance; that the relations of which I am speaking are not measured by the number of men alone, but generally by the amount of action, which is a combination of a multitude of causes; and that, further, if, to save words, I borrow for a moment the terms of geometry, I am none the less well aware that moral quantities do not allow of geometrical accuracy. The government is on a small scale what the body politic which includes it is on a great one. It is a moral person endowed with certain faculties, active like the Sovereign and passive like the State, and capable of being resolved into other similar relations. This accordingly gives rise to a new proportion, within which there is yet another, according to the arrangement of the magistracies, till an indivisible middle term is reached, i.e., a single ruler or supreme magistrate, who may be represented, in the midst of this progression, as the unity between the fractional and the ordinal series. Without encumbering ourselves with this multiplication of terms, let us rest content with regarding government as a new body within the State, distinct from the people and the Sovereign, and intermediate between them. There is between these two bodies this essential difference, that the State exists by itself, and the government only through the Sovereign. Thus the dominant **will** of the prince is, or **should be**, nothing but **the general will** or the law; his force is only the public force concentrated in his hands, and, as soon as he tries to base any absolute and independent act on his own authority, the tie that binds the whole together begins to be loosened. If finally the **prince** should come to have a particular will more active than the will of the Sovereign, and should employ the public force in his hands in obedience to this particular will, **there would be**, so to speak, **two** Sovereigns, one rightful and the other actual, the social union wou**ld** evaporate instantly, and **the body** politic would be dissolved.

The standard is **consistency with deliberative democracy**. This differs from other social contracts by locating the grounding contract not between the sovereign and the people since the two are not distinct entities, but among the people themselves to construct a legitimate sovereign in which everyone is included. Prefer because the AC provides an ontological account of the nation. It precedes ethical claims because unless we know what the nation is, we cannot know what its obligations could be. Absent an account of agent-specific obligation in the NC, prefer the AC framework since I have the only ethic applicable to the relevant resolutional actor.

A few implications:

a) The standard is strictly procedural, meaning it focuses on creating the institutional framework that allows healthy civil society via deliberation—the moment the state ceases to be legitimate, any further action would be unjustified—an action that violates the framework for some future net benefit would undermine its justification for existence. The framework is not a question of following what people want, but the procedural method to ensure that everyone’s voices are heard—you can’t promote an end state through procedurally illegitimate means.

b) Public institutions are the only legitimate locus of coercive force because only they can hope to represent the general will—this also proves the framework requires working within the system to effect change. Private means of revolt subvert the general will for particular ends, which is inconsistent with society.

Next is inherency: Despite high rates of school shootings, status quo laws permit guns on campus in many states, and legislative patterns indicate numbers will only increase.

#### Zillman ‘15[[3]](#footnote-3)

The killing of 10 people at a small community college campus in Oregon on Thursday delivered a painful reminder across the U.S. of the unnerving prevalence of gun violence in educational settings. Since the 2012 massacre at Sandy Hook Elementary in Connecticut, where a gunman killed 20 children and six staff members, there have been 142 school shootings in the U.S. That’s [equal to a rate of one per week](http://graphics.latimes.com/school-shootings-since-newtown/). Of those incidents, 62 took place on college campuses, including Thursday’s shooting at Umpqua Community College in southwest Oregon. While details are still developing about how the gunman at Umpqua—who was one of the 10 killed—planned and executed his assault, one that’s emerged is that when he entered the college campus armed [with six guns](http://www.wsj.com/articles/officials-search-home-of-suspect-in-deadly-oregon-college-shooting-1443793177), it was within his legal rights to do so. Oregon law allows the carrying of concealed weapons on public college campuses. That law is the result of a court decision in 2011 that kept public colleges from banning firearms on campus. Public schools can bar guns from specific settings—classrooms, dormitories, and sports stadiums—but not from the campus outright. Oregon’s leniency toward guns on campus is relatively unique in the U.S. All but nine [some] states either ban carrying a concealed weapon on a college campus or leave the decision to bar or allow on-campus firearms to the college or university, according to data collected by The Campaign to Keep Guns Off Campus, a group that aims to disarm schools. [10 States] Oregon—along with Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Mississippi, Oregon, Utah, Texas, and Wisconsin—have provisions that allow the carrying of concealed weapons on public campuses. And this year, lawmakers in several states launched multiple efforts to follow suit. In 2015, legislators in 15 states introduced 22 bills that called for a loosening of gun restrictions on college campuses, according to The Campaign to Keep Guns Off Campus. By comparison, [while] there was just one bill introduced that would make it tougher to carry a firearm on a college campus. The measure, introduced in California, would prohibit any concealed carry permit holder from bringing a weapon on a public or private college campus without permission from campus officials. It passed both houses of the state legislature and was submitted to Governor Jerry Brown for signature in early September. The pro-gun bills that state legislatures considered this year are indicative of a push by the gun lobby to open up another market of potential gun owners—college students. That’s very appealing to the industry’s biggest lobbying group, the National Rifle Association, and gun manufacturers, says Lindsay Nichols, a senior attorney at the Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence.

Thus the plan: Resolved: The United States federal government in conjunction with the 50 states and all relevant juridical actors and all colleges ought to ban private ownership of handguns on the campuses of colleges, universities, and other post-secondary institutions. Implementation is through normal means, I’m willing to clarify if you ask me to in cross-ex. [And I’ll clarify only the scope and implementation of the plan in case you’re confused—I’m not using this to shift my advocacy.]

#### Siebel ‘08[[4]](#footnote-4)

Now is the time to take action to protect the rights of students, faculty, staff, parents and educational institutions to keep guns off campus. Unfortunately, those legal rights are under attack by the gun lobby. The gun lobby is not known for issuing idle threats, and it has certainly made clear that it intends to push hard for arming students and teachers. n112 Indeed, barely a week after the massacre at Virginia Tech, a bill was introduced in South Carolina that would permit anyone with a CCW license to carry a concealed weapon "on the premises or property owned, operated, or controlled by a public school, elementary school, secondary school, college, university, technical college, or other post-secondary institution." n113 The bill would repeal existing South Carolina law that expressly prohibits CCW licensees from carrying guns into schools. n114 Similar bills have also been introduced in other states. n115 However, if educational institutions and the communities that support such institutions band together in opposition to these laws, changes in gun ownership policies can likely be stopped. Faced with the gun lobby's threat to pass legislation prohibiting employers from barring guns on company property, the business community has organized strong opposition in nearly every state where legislation has [\*337] been proposed. n116 The result has been a series of resounding defeats for the gun lobby. n117 There is no reason why academic institutions and the people that support them should not be similarly successful. Institutions that educate and protect America's youth should not have their legal rights trampled by organizations promoting an extremist agenda. We need to make society safer by reducing easy access to guns by criminals, the mentally ill, the unstable, or the suicidal, and not by making our schools more dangerous by allowing guns to be more accessible on college campuses.

The mere potential of guns in the classroom sows mistrust and fear, stifles discussion and undermines political freedom—that’s the antithesis of a deliberative community.

#### Debrabander ‘16[[5]](#footnote-5)

“Be careful discussing sensitive topics.” “Drop certain topics from your curriculum.” “[Don’t] ‘go there’ if you sense anger.” A faculty working group at the University of Houston recently offered these [were] recommendations to professors preparing for Texas’s new campus-carry law, set to take effect August 1. The situation to which these recommendations are alluding—gun violence in response to controversial or otherwise difficult classroom discussions—is at this point only a hypothetical worst-case scenario. But critics of the legislation are still appalled: To abide by the law, and keep everyone safe in classrooms with armed students, faculty may ultimately have to resort to self-censorship. Proponents of the legislation, which allows individuals with concealed-carry permits to possess firearms on public-university campuses, argue that fears surrounding campus carry are overblown. In the eight states that have already enacted such a law, none of the predicted nightmares have taken place—students drawing their weapons on professors who fail them, for example, or students firing on one another in heated classroom arguments. In fact, campus-carry supporters maintain that the law will keep the peace, enabling students and faculty to defend themselves effectively, and deter would-be shooters. So long as universities are gun-free zones, gun-rights advocates argue, they are well-advertised targets for prospective attackers. But the potential benefits of the law are slight, and dubious at best. It turns out, for example, there were armed students at Umpqua Community College in Oregon on the day of its shooting last fall. Their presence did not deter the attack, nor did they halt it; the students wisely decided not to jump into the fray for fear it would compound the mayhem. By contrast, campus carry’s potential for harm is quite real. Its principal threat is less than obvious, however; its impact may not be physically manifest at all. I’m counting its cost in terms of what is lost in the classroom—and it is a loss that may be deeply damaging to the country’s democracy. This can be gleaned from the faculty concerns at the University of Houston. In short, they argued that guns in the classroom pose an intolerable threat to free speech. It’s unclear whether campus carry does and will in fact undermine the freedom of expression, but if there’s one place in society where the citizenry must not tolerate such threats, it’s the college classroom. The college classroom is meant to be a special space where all manner of ideas are aired, considered, and debated, and differences negotiated—through speech and argument—with no fear of violent recrimination, no fear of inciting angry students to draw their guns. In my philosophy and politics classes, for example, I—like peers in my field—routinely broach contentious issues: topics such as structural racism, abortion, and gun rights (the most contentious of them all). Few young adults have put significant thought into these kinds of issues; they must experiment with them to understand them properly and deeply, and to develop mature and critical views. It’s important to ensure that students feel free to explore their thoughts and express them—frankly—so they can experiment and develop. They must feel free to push their intellectual limits, and entertain lines of argument that are controversial, probably offensive to some. It is a goal, an often elusive ideal, that the college classroom be that space where the circulation and contest of ideas are freewheeling and dynamic, as ideas are subjected to the close inspection of logic, and measured in the light of history and personal experience. This can—and many will say should—be a raucous affair on occasion. It seems that campus carry stands opposed to these pedagogical goals. Will guns encourage speech and invite people to discussion and debate in the classroom? The reality could be quite to the contrary: Guns could have a chastening effect. If students suspect that [classmates] neighbors in the classroom may be armed, this may make them less inclined to engage them in frank and open discussion, on potentially uncomfortable or challenging topics. Guns speak; they send a message, which, gun owners and gun rights advocates readily admit, is something like this: Don’t mess with me—be careful—I am armed; I know how to use my weapon, and am prepared to do so if need be. Thanks to Stand Your Ground, they may draw their weapons on merely perceived threats. […] It’s impossible to measure the cost of campus carry. But I wager that the cost will be evidenced in the mounting silence on college campuses, and the trepidation, timidity, and lack of creativity among new generations of voters. American democracy will be the poorer for it.

Guns in higher education limit liberatory potential. College classrooms are a unique and necessary space to explore and hone critical ideas before they emerge into society at large—historic expansions of civil rights prove.

#### Debrabander ‘16[[6]](#footnote-6)

One University of Houston professor, Maria Gonzalez, expressed her concerns over campus carry in the context of her own classes, which cover Marxist and Queer Theory. In so doing, she invoked the added mission universities have to provide safe harbor for ideas that may be unpopular in society at large, ideas that are radical to some. This is a key reason why universities offer tenure to faculty: to protect academic freedom and defend against censorship. Expansions of civil rights are almost always deeply unpopular at first; this was the case in the fight for women’s rights, suffrage for African Americans, and marriage equality for gays and lesbians. Universities play a key role in early discussions about expanding these rights: Radical ideas must be given a hearing, and require a space to be vetted and honed before emerging into the culture at large, and ultimately the political stage. I fear that campus carry will make students and faculty less inclined to engage in the critical intellectual work that must take place in the classroom, the courageous inquiry and experimentation American democracy requires. As Gonzalez suggests, classes devoted to highly controversial topics could be the most vulnerable in this respect. How many students are going to risk uncomfortable and potentially intrusive lines of inquiry about gender identity, for example, in conservative Texas—when some of their conservative peers may well be armed? Why even go there, if you are an instructor, and can’t hope to have a productive or illuminating conversation?

And, campus carry silences minority voices in particular—black students are especially vulnerable to gun violence, while simultaneously ostracized if they choose to carry themselves.

#### Gordon et al. ‘15[[7]](#footnote-7)

In this country, which devalues black life as one of its founding principles, the expansion of citizens’ rights to bear firearms facilitates the violent deaths of Blacks. Accordingly, the faculty of the John L. Warfield Center for African and African American Studies stands with African and African Diaspora Studies Department (AADS) in opposing the implementation of Texas SB11. This law will allow the more than 800,000 Texas Concealed Handgun License holders to carry their concealed weapons into buildings on our campus. Allowing firearms on campus places UT’s [the] Black population in a particularly vulnerable position. Many of us are concentrated spatially, politically, and intellectually in Black Studies. Ours is a particularly controversial discipline that deals with provocative themes such as anti-blackness, white supremacy, patriarchy, homophobia, economic oppression, and crosscutting differences and power. Black Studies grapples with these issues and the Black experience in general as a part of scholarly endeavors that aim to promote social justice and equity. Educational exchanges around such subject matter are often highly charged, difficult, and consequential. It is not uncommon for Warfield Center faculty to be the object of documented threats and harassment in our offices and lecture halls. The presence of firearms will not only stifle the free exchange of ideas but can be the basis for deadly violence against [black students and faculty] us in these often fraught settings. Moreover, African Americans are disproportionality affected by the saturation of our society by firearms. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention the death rate due to gun violence for Blacks is more than twice that of whites. Vigilante and extra-judicial killings of Black people, [and] as well as the police-involved shootings that saturate our news coverage and our daily lives, point to the distinctly vulnerable position of Black people when it comes to firearm violence. Applied to our situation here at UT, in the presence of firearms the probability that bullets will find us is higher than for any other campus population. At the same time, racial bias functionally excludes Black people from accessing the rights afforded by campus carry legislation, as [they] we would be more likely than our white counterparts to be perceived as actionable threats by fellow citizens and police officers alike.

And, handguns on campus substantially increase students’ vulnerability to sexual assault—they not only aid the attacker, but ensures them with a sense of security for future crimes. Handguns are also useless for self-defense—they’re often taken and used against them.

#### Quinonez ‘15[[8]](#footnote-8)

Statistics prove that guns are rarely used for self-defense in any type of situation. In a 2010 report from the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting program, there were 230 justifiable homicides involving a private citizen using a firearm in self-defense during either an attempted or a completed crime. In another survey, the Violence Policy Center found that only 0.8 percent of violent crimes and only 0.1 percent of property crimes involved the victim using a firearm in self-defense. “Given that between 40-45 percent of American households own a gun, and less than 0.1 percent of victims of property crime end up using a gun to stop a crime, it’s impossible to suggest that guns are being effectively used in self-defense,” said Evan DeFilippis, an economics, political science and psychology graduate from the University of Oklahoma. In another study published in the American Journal of Public Health, researchers interviewed [of] 417 women from 67 battered women’s shelters and found that nearly a third of them had lived in a household with a firearm and two-thirds of them were cases where their intimate partners had used the gun against them. If women were allowed to carry them on campuses, the likelihood of them actually purchasing one or even knowing how to use one would be slim anyway since only about 23 percent of Americans who own guns are women. It could even be counterproductive. If more men carried guns on campus, it could put women in a vulnerable predicament. In addition, it could also increase gun-related risks since college students would be prone to having gun accidents with the high rates of binge drinking. According to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, about 1,825 college students die each year from alcohol-related unintentional injuries. More than 97,000 students are victims of alcohol-related sexual assault and more than 599,000 students receive unintentional injuries while under the influence. Allowing all college students to carry guns could open so many doors and increase these numbers. “If you have a rape situation, usually it starts with some sort of consensual behavior, and by the time it switches to non-consensual, it would be nearly impossible to run for a gun. Maybe if it’s someone who raped you before and is coming back, it theoretically could help them feel more secure,” said John D. Foubert, national president of One in Four, an educational program on sexual assault on college campuses. Politicians and lawmakers aiming to pass these bills misunderstand the rape culture and should really reconsider their stance on such a reckless cause.

This particular card talks about the vulnerability of women but that doesn’t deny that men are assaulted too—and, queer and trans folk are undoubtedly even more vulnerable.

Banning private ownership of handguns on college campuses dismantles the perception of gun-carrying peers and faculty, encouraging open discussion and speech. But also, gun-carrying on campus is a product of a militaristic culture is predicated on neoliberal individualism, which normalizes violence against marginalized groups and fosters apathy to the suffering of others. While diverse social factors contribute to it, the Aff ruptures this culture in favor of democratic values.

#### Giroux ‘15[[9]](#footnote-9)

Nine people were killed and seven wounded recently in a mass shooting at a community college in Roseburg, Oregon. Such shootings are more than another tragic expression of unchecked violence in the United States; they are symptomatic of a society engulfed in fear, militarism, [and] a survival-of-the-fittest ethos and a growing disdain for human life. Sadly, this shooting is not an isolated incident. Over 270 mass shootings have taken place in the United States this year alone, proving once again that the economic, political and social conditions that underlie such violence are not being addressed. In the United States, calls for liberal, Band-Aid reforms do not work in the face of the carnage taking place. "The United States sees an average of 92 gun deaths per day - and more preschoolers are shot dead each year than police officers are killed in the line of duty." [(1)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a1) Mass violence in the United States has to be understood within a larger construction of the totality of the forces that produce it. Focusing merely on the more dramatic shootings misses the extent of the needless violence and murders that are taking place daily. State repression, unbridled self-interest, an empty consumerist ethos and war-like values have become the organizing principles of US society, producing an indifference to the common good, compassion, a concern for others and equality. As the public collapses into the individualized values of a banal consumer culture and the lure of private obsessions, US society flirts with forms of irrationality that are at the heart of everyday aggression and the withering of public life. US society is driven by unrestrained market values in which economic actions and financial exchanges are divorced from social costs, further undermining any sense of social responsibility. In addition, a wasteful, giant military-industrial-surveillance complex fueled by the war on terror, along with the United States' endless consumption of violence as entertainment and its celebration of a pervasive gun culture, normalizes the everyday violence waged against Black youth, immigrants, children fed into the school-to-prison pipeline and others considered disposable. US politicians now attempt to govern the effects of systemic violence while ignoring its underlying causes. Under such circumstances, a society saturated in violence gains credence when its political leaders have given up on the notion of the common good, social justice and equality, all of which appear to have become relics of history in the United States. In the face of mass shootings, the public relations disimagination machine goes into overdrive claiming that guns are not the problem, and that the causes of such violence can be largely attributed to people living with mentally illness. When in actuality, as two Vanderbilt University researchers, Dr. Jonathan Metzl and Kenneth T. MacLeish, publishing in the American Journal of Public Health, observed that: Fewer than 6 percent of the 120,000 gun-related killings in the United States between 2001 and 2010 were perpetrated by people diagnosed with mental illness. Our research finds that across the board, the mentally ill are 60 to 120 percent more likely than the average person to be the victims of violent crime rather than the perpetrators.... There are 32,000 gun deaths in the United States on average every year, and people are far more likely to be shot by relatives, friends or acquaintances than they are by lone violent psychopaths. [(2)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a2) It may not be an exaggeration to claim that the US government has blood on its hands because of the refusal of Congress to rein in a gun lobby that produces a growing militarism that sanctions a love affair with the unbridled corporate institutions, financial interests and mass-produced cultures of violence. The Oregon community college shooting is the 41st school shooting this year while there have been 142 incidents of violence on school properties since 2012. Yet, the violence continues unchecked, all the while legitimated by the cowardly acts of politicians who refuse to enact legislation to curb the proliferation of guns or support measures as elementary as background checks - which 88 percent of the American people support - or for that matter, ban large-capacity ammunition magazines and assault rifles. In part, this cowardly refusal on the part of politicians is due to the fact that gun lobbyists pour huge amounts of money into the campaigns of politicians who support their interests. For example, in 2015, the gun lobby spent $5,697,429 while those supporting gun control paid out $867,601. In a New York Times op-ed, Gabrielle Giffords pointed out that the National Rifle Association (NRA) in the 2012 election cycle "spent around $25 million on contributions, lobbying and outside spending."[(3)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a3) Outside money does more than corrupt politics; it is also responsible for people being shot and killed. The culture of violence cannot be abstracted from the business of violence. Many Americans are obsessed with violence. They not only own nearly 300 million firearms, but also have a love affair with powerful weaponry such as 9mm Glock semiautomatic pistols and AR-15 assault rifles. Collective anger, frustration, fear and resentment increasingly characterize a society in which people are out of work, young people cannot imagine a decent future, everyday behaviors are criminalized, inequality in wealth and income are soaring and the police are viewed as occupying armies. This is not only a recipe for both random violence and mass shootings; it makes such acts appear routine and commonplace. Fear has become a public relations strategy used not only by the national security state but also by the gun industry. When you live in a country in which you are constantly bombarded by the assumption that the government is the enemy of democracy and you are told that nobody can be trusted, and the discourse of hate, particularly against Black youth, immigrants and gun control advocates, spews out daily from thousands of conservative radio stations and major TV networks, a climate of fear engulfs the country reinforce[s]ing the belief that gun ownership is the only notion of safety in which people can believe in order to live as free human beings. Under such circumstances, genuine fears and concerns for safety are undermined. These include the fear of [such as] poverty, lack of meaningful employment, the absence of decent health care, poor schools, police violence and the militarization of society, all of which further legitimate and fuel the machinery of insecurity, violence and death. Fear degenerates into willful ignorance while any semblance of rationality is erased, especially around the logic of gun control. As Adam Gopnik observes: Gun control ends gun violence as surely an antibiotics end bacterial infections, as surely as vaccines end childhood measles - not perfectly and in every case, but overwhelmingly and everywhere that it's been taken seriously and tried at length. These lives can be saved. Kids continue to die en masse because one political party won't allow that to change, and the party won't allow it to change because of the irrational and often paranoid fixations that make the massacre of students and children an acceptable cost of fetishizing guns. [(4)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a4) President Obama is right in stating that the violence we see in the United States is "a political choice we make that allows this to happen." While taking aim at the gun lobby, especially the NRA, what Obama fails to address is that extreme violence is systemic in US society, has become the foundation of politics and must be understood within a broader historical, economic, cultural and political context. To be precise, politics has become an extension of violence driven by a culture of fear, cruelty and hatred legitimated by the politicians bought and sold by the gun lobby and other related militaristic interests. Moreover, violence is now treated as a sport, a pleasure-producing form of commerce, a source of major profits for the defense industries and a corrosive influence upon US democracy. And as such it is an expression of a deeper political and ethical corruption in US society. As Rich Broderick insists, US society "embraces a soulless free-market idolatry in which the value of everything, including human beings, is determined by the bottom line" and in doing so this market fundamentalism and its theater of cruelty and greed perpetuate a spectacle of violence fed by an echo chamber "of paranoia, racism, and apocalyptic fantasies rampant in the gun culture." [(5)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a5) The lesson here is that the culture of violence cannot be abstracted from the business of violence. Murdering children in schools, the streets, in jails, detention centers and other places increasingly deemed unsafe has become something of a national pastime. One wonders how many innocent children have to die in the United States before it becomes clear that the revenue made by the $13.5 billion gun industry, with a $1.5 billion profit, are fueling a national bloodbath by using lobbyists to pay off politicians, wage a mammoth propaganda campaign and induct young children into the culture of violence. [(6)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a6) What is clear is that as more guns are on the streets and in the hands of people a savage killing machine is unleashed on those who are largely poor, Black and vulnerable. The widespread availability of guns is the reason for the shooting and killing of children and adults in Chicago, Boston, Ferguson, New York City and in other major cities. The Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence reports that "in 2010, guns took the lives of 31,076 Americans in homicides, suicides and unintentional shootings. This is the equivalent of more than 85 deaths each day and more than three deaths each hour. [In addition], 73,505 Americans were treated in hospital emergency departments for non-fatal gunshot wounds in 2010." [(7)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a7) And the toll of gun violence on young people is truly heartbreaking with almost 30,000 young people killed in a 10-year period, which amounts "to nearly 3,000 kids shot to death in a typical year."[(8)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a8) According to a Carnegie-Knight News21 program investigation, For every US soldier killed in Afghanistan during 11 years of war, at least 13 children were shot and killed in the United States. More than 450 kids didn't make it to kindergarten. Another 2,700 or more were killed by a firearm before they could sit behind the wheel of a car. Every day, on average, seven children were shot dead. A News21 investigation of child and youth deaths in the United States between 2002 and 2012 found that at least 28,000 children and teens 19-years-old and younger were killed with guns. Teenagers between the ages of 15 and 19 made up over two-thirds of all youth gun deaths in the United States. [(9)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a9) Even worse, the firearms industry is pouring millions into recruiting and educational campaigns designed to both expose children to guns at an early age and to recruit them as lifelong gun enthusiasts. Reporting on such efforts for The New York Times, Mike McIntire writes: The industry's strategies include giving firearms, ammunition and cash to youth groups; weakening state restrictions on hunting by young children; marketing an affordable military-style rifle for "junior shooters" and sponsoring semiautomatic-handgun competitions for youths; and developing a target-shooting video game that promotes brand-name weapons, with links to the Web sites of their makers.... Newer initiatives by other organizations go further, seeking to introduce children to high-powered rifles and handguns while invoking the same rationale of those older, more traditional programs: that firearms can teach "life skills" like responsibility, ethics and citizenship. [(10)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a10) As the United States moves from a welfare state to a warfare state, state violence becomes normalized. The United States' moral compass and its highest democratic ideals have begun to wither, and the institutions that were once designed to help people now serve to largely suppress them. Gun laws, social responsibility and a government responsive to its people matter. We must end the dominance of gun lobbyists, the reign of money-controlled politics, the proliferation of high levels of violence in popular culture and the ongoing milita.rization of US society. At the same time, it is crucial, as many in the movement for Black lives have stated, that we refuse to endorse the kind of gun control that criminalizes young people of color. Gun violence in the United States is inextricably tied to economic violence as when hedge fund managers invest heavily in companies that make high-powered automatic rifles, 44-40 Colt revolvers, laser scopes for semiautomatic handguns and expanded magazine clips. [(11)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a11) The same mentality that trades in profits at the expense of human life gives the United States the shameful title of being the world's largest arms exporter. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, "Washington sold 31% of all global imports during the 2010-2014 period."[(12)](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33127-murder-incorporated-guns-and-the-growing-culture-of-violence-in-the-us#a12) This epidemic of violence connects the spreading of violence abroad with the violence waged at home. It also points to the violence reproduced by politicians who would rather support the military-industrial-gun complex and arms industries than address the most basic needs and social problems faced by Americans. Rather than arming people with more guns, criminalizing every aspect of social behavior, militarizing the police and allowing the gun lobby to sanction putting semiautomatic weapons in the hands of children and adults, the most immediate action that can be taken is to institute effective gun control laws. As Bernardine Dohrn has argued: We want gun control that sanctions manufacturers, distributors and adults who place, and profit from, deadly weapons in the possession of youth. We want military-style weaponry banned. We want smaller schools with nurses and social workers, librarians and parent volunteers—all of which are shown to contribute to less disruption and less violence. Let's promote gun-control provisions and regulations that enhance teaching and learning as well as justice and safety for children, not those that will further incarcerate, punish and demonize young people of color. We've been there before. And Dohrn's suggestions would be only the beginning of real reform, one that goes right to the heart of eliminating the violence at the core of US society. The United States has become a society that is indifferent to the welfare of its citizens, as the drive for profits has replaced any vestige of social and moral responsibility. Violence has arisen from the breakdown of public space, the erasure of public goods and a growing disdain for the common good. Gratuitous violence is no longer merely a sport or form of entertainment; it has become central to a society that trades on fear and fetishizes hyperviolent and punitive practices and social relations. Brutal, masculine authority now rules US society and wages a war against women's reproductive rights, civil liberties, poor Black and Brown youth and Mexican immigrants. When violence becomes an organizing principle of society, the fabric of a democracy begins to unravel, suggesting that the United States is at war with itself. When politicians refuse out of narrow self and financial interests to confront the conditions that create such violence, they have blood on their hands.

And, Even if concealed-carry were allowed, students are unlikely to obtain guns as a result—empirics and multiple deterring factors prove.

#### Bouffard et al. ‘12[[10]](#footnote-10)

One particularly important issue for future research is the number of individuals that do not currently possess [concealed handgun licenses] CHLs who would actually obtain one, simply if concealed carry on campus were allowed. Our results revealed substantial differences between the numbers of current CHL holders and those reporting some intention to obtain one if campus concealed carry was legalized. It seems unlikely that the number of students with a [concealed handgun license] CHL would increase 1,000 simply because campus concealed carry were allowed, as some of the current estimates would suggest. However, the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975), and its later expansion in the form of Azjen’s (1991) theory of planned behavior, would suggest that intentions to engage in a particular behavior are significantly, though not always, strongly correlated with actual behaviors. This is especially true for conventional behaviors (i.e., eating in a restaurant, voting) on which most of the existing research on these theories has been conducted (Sheppard, Hartwick, and Warshaw, 1988). In a meta-analysis of the strength of the intentions–behavior (IB) relationship among 87 published studies, the average IB correlation was 0.53 but had a 95 confidence interval that included values ranging from 0.15 to 0.92 (Sheppard et al., 1988). As such, although one could expect some number of those who do not currently possess a [license] CHL to obtain one if they expressed interest in doing so, exactly what proportion would follow through with their intentions is unknown. To obtain a CHL in Texas, an individual must take a 10-hr firearms proficiency course (which can cost more than US$100) and pay application fees of US$140. It is possible, if not likely, that these factors prevent some students from applying for and obtaining a [license] CHL to the same or even greater extent than does the current ban on campus carry. Students in particular, with more limited financial means, may be even more dissuaded from acquiring a CHL given these barriers than might faculty or staff members. Future research is needed to better understand the predictors of students actually obtaining CHLs and how these may vary across states (as CHL costs and requirements vary). Allowing current [license] CHL holders to carry concealed handguns on campus in some cases would appear to have minimal impact on the prevalence of concealed handgun carrying on campus (4 of classrooms with a current CHL holder); however, if all of those who expressed strong interest in obtaining a CHL and carrying on campus were to actually do so, then a policy change might have a much larger impact (100 of classrooms with a student who strongly intends to obtain a CHL and carry in some buildings).

And, Banning guns **won’t** attract shooters; in fact, mass shooters are more likely to target concealed-carry locations than gun-free zones—turns your offense.

#### PHW ‘14[[11]](#footnote-11)

The gun lobby also conveniently overlooks the evidence that completely undermines their claim that shooters target certain locations because they are known to be gun-free zones. In an analysis of 62 mass shootings over the last 30 years, investigators found that “not a single case includes evidence that the killer chose to target a place because it banned guns. To the contrary, in many of the cases there was clearly another motive for the choice of location.” Campus shooters are also frequently suicidal. Most of the campus shootings in America in recent years (i.e., Virginia Tech, Northern Illinois University, Louisiana Technical College, etc.) were murder-suicides. These shooters left home on the morning of their attacks knowing they were going to die by gunfire before the day was over—their goal was simply to take as many people with them as they could. It is extremely unlikely that these shooters would have been deterred by the knowledge that their fellow students (or campus faculty) [who] might be armed. In fact, it is possible that a college campus that allows students and employees to carry concealed handguns might provide a more attractive target to such shooters. Lacking any fear of death, they might welcome the opportunity to provoke shootouts and crossfire among relatively untrained concealed carry permit holders in order to increase casualties. In the same study mentioned above, investigators [found](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/04/gun-free-zones-mass-shootings) that armed bystanders did not provide help in any of the 62 mass shootings – rather, they increased the numbers of innocent people killed: “In cases in Washington and Texas in 2005, would-be heroes who tried to take action with licensed firearms were gravely wounded and killed. In the Tucson mass shooting in 2011, an armed citizen admitted to coming within a split second of gunning down the wrong person—one of the bystanders who’d helped tackle and subdue the actual killer.” There have also been numerous incidents in recent years where shooters have targeted what might be deemed “gun-full zones” for their attacks, including: May 8, 2006—Michael Kennedy, 18, attacks Fairfax County Police Sully District Station in Virginia, firing more than 70 rounds and killing two officers before police are able to take him down. Kennedy is armed with five handguns and two rifles, including a semiautomatic AK-47 assault rifle, and carries more than 300 rounds of ammunition. May 19, 2007—Jason Hamilton shoots and kills his wife at home and then attacks a sheriff’s department at Latah County Courthouse and a church in Moscow, Idaho. Hamilton kills a total of three people, including a police officer, before taking his own life. He is armed with an AK-47 assault rifle and an M1 carbine despite a long history of domestic violence, mental illness, and run-ins with the police. Local resident and University of Idaho student Pete Hussmann, 20, races to the courthouse on his bike armed with a .45 caliber handgun and is shot four times by Hamilton. “It was like a war zone,” says Hussmann. Two other law enforcement officers are wounded. There is no evidence that shooters, particularly those who are suicidal, would be deterred from attacks on college campuses by concealed carry permit holders. To the extent that they could provoke firefights with such individuals in crowded college classrooms and create additional mayhem, they might even seek out such confrontations.
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