# Counter Plan 1

**A- Counterplan Text:** The United States federal government in a coordinated effort with the fifty states ought to create a national gun registry, ban private gun sales, and after six months ban private ownership of handguns. Aff can’t solve without a national registry—people won’t comply with the laws. Six month waiting period is key to getting people on the books for an effective ban. **Sporks:** 12 “How to Ban Guns: A step by step, long term process” Daily Kos December 21st 2012<http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/12/21/1172661/-How-to-Ban-Guns-A-step-by-step-long-term-process>

**The only way we can** truly be safe and **prevent** further **gun violence is to ban civilian ownership** of all guns. That means everything. No pistols, no revolvers, no semiautomatic or automatic rifles. No bolt action. No breaking actions or falling blocks. Nothing. This is the only thing that we can possibly do to keep our children safe from both mass murder and common street violence. Unfortunately, right now we can't. The political will is there, but the institutions are not. Honestly, this is a good thing. **If we passed a law tomorrow banning all firearms, we would have massive noncompliance.** What we need to do is establish the regulatory and informational institutions first. This is how we do it: **The very first thing** **we need is national registry.** We need to know where the guns are, and who has them. Canada has a national firearms registry. We need to copy their model. We need a law demanding all firearms be registered to a national database. We need to know who has them and where they are. We need to make this as easy as possible for gun owners**. The federal government provides the money** and technical expertise, **and the State[s]** police **carry it out.** Like a funded mandate. Most firearms already have a serial number on them, so it would really be a matter of taking the information already on the ATF form 4473 and putting it in a national database. I think **about 6 months should be enough time**. **Along with this, make private sales illegal**. **When a firearm is transferred, make it law that the registration must be updated**. Again, make it super easy to do. Perhaps over, the internet. Dealers can log in by their FFLs and update the registration. Additionally, new guns are to be registered by the manufacturer. The object here is to create a clear paper trail from factory to distributor to dealer to owner. We want to encourage as much voluntary compliance as possible.Now we get down to it. The registration period has passed. Now we have criminals without registered guns running around. Probably kooky types that "lost" them on a boat or something. So remember those ATF form 4473s? Those record every firearm sale, going back twenty years. And those have to be surrendered to the ATF on demand. So, we get those logbooks, and cross reference the names and addresses with the new national registry. Since most NRA types own two or (many) more guns, we can get an idea of who properly registered their guns and who didn't. For example, if we have a guy who purchased 6 guns over the course of 10 years, but only registered two of them, that raises a red flag.Now, maybe he sold them or they got lost or something. But it gives us a good target for investigation. A nice visit by the ATF or state police to find out if he really does still have those guns would be certainly warranted. It's certainly not perfect. People may have gotten guns from parents or family, and not registered them. Perfect is the enemy of pretty darn good, as they say. This exercise isn't so much to track down every gun ever sold; the main idea would be to profile and investigate people that may not have registered their guns. As an example, I'm not so concerned with the guy who bought that bolt action Mauser a decade ago and doesn't have anything registered to his name. It's a pretty good possibility that he sold it, gave it away, or got rid of it somehow. And even if he didn't, that guy is not who I'm concerned with. I'm concerned that other guy who bought a half dozen assault weapons, registered two hunting rifles, and belongs to the NRA/GOA. He's the guy who warrants a raid. So registration is the first step. Now that the vast majority are registered, we can do what we will. **One good first step would be to close the registry to new registrations.** **This would**, in effect, **prevent new guns from being made or imported**. This would put the murder machine corporations out of business for good, and cut the money supply to the NRA/GOA. As money dries up, the political capital needed for new controls will be greatly reduced. There are a few other things I would suggest. I would suggest an immediate, national ban on concealed carry. A ban on internet sales of guns and ammunition is a no brainer. [Microstamping](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Firearm_microstamping) would also be a very good thing. Even if the only thing it does is drive up costs, it could still lead to crimes being solved. I'm willing to try every advantage we can get. A national Firearms Owner Identification Card might be good, but I'm not sure if it's necessary if we have a national database. We should also insist on comprehensive insurance and mandatory gun safes, subject to random, spot checks by local and federal law enforcement. We must make guns expensive and unpopular, just like cigarettes. **A nationwide, antigun campaign paid for** by **a per gun yearly tax paid by owners,** dealers, and manufacturers would work well in this regard. We should also segway into an anti-hunting campaign, like those in the UK. By making hunting expensive and unpopular, we can make the transition to a gun free society much less of a headache for us. I know this seems harsh, but this is the only way we can be truly safe. I don't want my kids being shot at by a deranged NRA member. I'm sure you don't either. So lets stop looking for short term solutions and start looking long term. **Registration is the first step. Tell Pres. Obama and democrats in congress to demand mandatory, comprehensive gun registration. It's the only way we can ban guns with any effectiveness.**

**B- Competition:**

Mutually exclusive- a) you defend that we do the plan now- perm would be severance.

Net Beneftis

**C- Solvency and Net Benefits:**

#### A ban on handguns makes more people buy from the informal sector where guns are cheaper and more available. **Kopel:** David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. "PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION" Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm>

#### On the other hand, if the person believes that the threats to his or her [their] life and family are serious enough to commit the serious crime of [enough to] buying an illegal handgun, the additional risk posed by potentially defective handgun may seem small. In addition, newfound popularity for bootleg guns might result in handguns becoming cheaper than they are now, just as in alcohol prohibition days, bootleg gin often cost less than legal alcohol had. If handguns were cheaper, they might become more available to small-time teenage criminals and other low-end miscreants; criminals might end up more widely armed than ever before. The inevitable black market in homemade and imported illegal handguns would provide a major new revenue source to organized crime. As the black market in alcohol helped create and enrich organized crime in the United States, the new black market in handguns would fund and strengthen organized crime all the more. Dixon also acknowledges that illegal handguns would also flow in across American borders. [[130](http://i2i.org/SuptDocs/IssuPprs/lrstlupl.htm#130)] Indeed, if small handguns were imported in the same physical volume as marijuana, 20 million would enter the country annually. (Current legal demand for new handguns is about 2.5 million a year).

The CP solves and is key to destroying the illegal market. **PVG** ’13 Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence “Registration of Firearms Policy Summary” October 1st 2013<http://smartgunlaws.org/registration-of-firearms-policy-summary/>

**Firearm registration** laws **require individuals to record their ownership** of a firearm with a designated law enforcement agency.  These laws **enable law enforcement to identify, disarm, and prosecute violent criminals and people illegally in possession of firearms**.  Registration systems also create ` accountability for firearm owners and discourage illegal sales. **Firearm registration laws can lead to the identification and prosecution of violent criminals by helping law enforcement** quickly and **reliably “trace”** (identify the source of) **firearms recovered from crime scenes.**Firearm registration laws create comprehensive records of firearm ownership, which include a full description of each firearm and identify the owner.  Comprehensive **registration laws also require a firearm to be re-registered whenever title to the firearm is transferred**, and law enforcement to be notified whenever the weapon is lost or stolen.  As a result, registration laws help law enforcement quickly and reliably identify the owner of any firearm used in a crime. Additional information on crime gun tracing, firearm sales reporting requirements and retention of firearm sales records is contained in our summary on [Maintaining Records & Reporting Gun Sales](http://smartgunlaws.org/retention-of-sales-background-check-records-policy-summary/). **Firearm registration laws also help law enforcement retrieve firearms from persons who have become legally prohibited from possessing them through criminal convictions** or other prohibitions. Comprehensive registration laws require gun owners to renew their registration annually or explain why they should no longer be legally responsible for the weapon.  During the renewal process, owners undergo additional background checks to ensure that they have not fallen into a class prohibited from possessing firearms. The renewal process, therefore, creates an opportunity for law enforcement to remove illegally possessed firearms. In addition, **registration laws help reduce illegal firearm sales and transfers by creating accountability for gun owners**. **A firearm owner who knows that law enforcement has the ability to trace the firearm back** to him or her **may be deterred from transferring the firearm to a potentially dangerous individual**, and may be encouraged to store his or her firearm safely so as to prevent unauthorized access or theft.  Registration laws also help deter “straw purchases,” in which an eligible person purchases a firearm on behalf of an ineligible person or a person who wants to avoid having the gun traced back to him or her. For more information about straw purchases, see our summary on [Gun Trafficking & Straw Purchases](http://smartgunlaws.org/trafficking-policy-summary/). Information generated by firearm registration systems can also help protect law enforcement officers responding to an incident by providing them with information about whether firearms may be present at the scene and, if so, how many and what types. Registration laws are most effective when combined with laws requiring licensing of firearm owners and purchasers.[1](http://smartgunlaws.org/registration-of-firearms-policy-summary/#footnote_0_5700)  **A 2001 study** analyzing the firearm tracing data of crime guns recovered in 25 U.S. **cities revealed that states with** some form of both **registration** and licensing ha**ve greater success keeping firearms initially sold by dealers** in the state **from being recovered in crimes** than states without such systems in place.[2](http://smartgunlaws.org/registration-of-firearms-policy-summary/#footnote_1_5700)  This data suggests that licensing and registration laws make it more difficult for criminals, juveniles and other prohibited purchasers to obtain guns, and help ensure that firearm owners remain eligible to possess their weapons. For more information on licensing laws, see our summary on [Licensing Gun Owners & Purchasers](http://smartgunlaws.org/licensing-of-gun-owners-purchasers-policy-summary/).

And unlike the aff the CP has no backlash- people want the CP. **PVG**: ’13 Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence “Registration of Firearms Policy Summary” October 1st 2013<http://smartgunlaws.org/registration-of-firearms-policy-summary/>

**The American public strongly supports laws requiring gun registration.  A nationwide survey conducted in January 2011 found that 66% of respondents favor laws requiring every gun owner to register each gun he or she owns as part of a national gun registry**.[3](http://smartgunlaws.org/registration-of-firearms-policy-summary/#footnote_2_5700)  A poll conducted in May 2001 found that 70% of respondents mistakenly believe that a registration system already exists in the United States.

And Registry was an integral part of Australia’s program which your aff is modeled after. **Neill** 10 Andrew Leigh, Research School of Economics, Australian National University and Christine Neill, Department of Economics , Wilfrid Laurier University.  Do Gun Buybacks Save Lives? Evidence from Panel Data Author(s): Andrew Leigh and Christine Neill Source: American Law and Economics Review, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Fall 2010), pp. 509-557 Published by: Oxford University Press Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42705584>

**Several factors are important in assessing the** extent to which the **results from the Australian buyback can be extrapolated to other countries**. Australian borders are more easily controlled than in countries that have land borders. In addition, Australia's government in general and its policing and customs services in particular are highly organized and effective. **The NFA also had an extremely high degree of political support** and was quite competently executed. **And the buyback was accompanied by a uniform national system for licensing and registration of firearms**. **These factors should be borne in mind in considering the extent to which the results from the Australian NFA might generalize to other countries.**

CP solves Stop and Frisk because of the registry. Stop and frisk is an independent reason to prefer the CP- the plan causes more racist enforcement because police just get to pick who they want to check. **Gourevitch 15**

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

As multiple police killings of unarmed black men have reminded us, the police already operate with barely constrained force in poor, minority neighborhoods. **From** SWAT to **stop-and-frisk** to mass incarceration to parole monitoring, **the police manage a panoply of programs that subject these populations to multiple layers of coercion and control**. As a consequence, more than 7 million Americans are subject to some form of correctional control, an extremely disproportionate number of whom are poor and minority. While it is commonly assumed that the drug war is to blame for all this, work by scholars like Benjamin Levin and Jeff Fagan demonstrates that already existing gun control efforts also play an important role. One of the most notorious areas of policing, the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk program, was justified as a gun control rather than a drug war measure. In the name of preventing violence, **hundreds of thousands of poor minorities are subject to searches without probable cause each year**. Further, a range of Supreme Court-authorized exceptions to standard Fourth Amendment protections against illegal search and seizure derive from a concern with gun violence. This invasiveness is a necessary feature of criminalized gun possession. After all, policing guns is just like policing drugs. Like drugs, there are a vast number of guns. Possession is far more widespread than can possibly be policed so decisions have to be made about where to devote resources. Furthermore, since possession itself is the crime, the only way to police that crime is to shift from actual harm to identifying and preventing risks. As legal scholar Benjamin Levin argues in a forthcoming piece “Searching for guns – like searching for drugs – can easily become pretextual, a proxy for some general prediction of risk, danger, or lawlessness.” In other words, there must be selective enforcement, where enforcement includes invasive searches based on existing prejudices about who is and isn’t dangerous. For example, as research by Jeff Fagan and Garth Davies shows, in the late 1990s, **the NYPD used suspected weapons violations to justify numerous stops, even though these stops resulted in fewer arrests than stops for other crimes. And when it comes to individualized assessments of who is dangerous and worthy of punishment, every study shows** steep, and unfounded, **bias**. Michelle Alexander, quotes a former U.S. attorney in her recent sensation, “

# Counter Plan 2

**A- Counterplan Text:** The aff actor bans handguns for everyone except Indian Americans living on reservations. I am willing to give them turns to this PIC if necessary they should ask in cross-ex. I am willing to flash you offense during prep time if you want me to, so we can avoid a theory debate.

**B- Competition:**

1. Mutually exclusive: They said they defend for the entire geographical area of the United States, the perm would be severance.
2. Net benefits

**C- Solvency and Net Benefits:**

1) USFG forcing Reservations to implement the policy would destroy tribal sovereignty and reentrench the mindset of colonization.

2) The United States has constantly forcibly disarmed Indians, guns are key to Indian culture.

**Twedy:** Ann TwedyAssociate Professor. Hamline University School of Law; “INDIAN TRIBES AND GUN REGULATION: SHOULD TRIBES EXERCISE THEIR SOVEREIGN RIGHTS TO ENACT GUN BANS OR STAND-YOUR-GROUND LAWS?”; <http://www.albanylawreview.org/Articles/Vol78_2/78.2.885%20Tweedy.pdf>; Accessed 3/30/16; published 3/11/15; PE

**Tribes have powerful reasons** both **to** want to **protect gun rights** and to enact stringent firearm regulations. As sovereigns, they should be able to strike that balance for themselves, according to their differing needs and values, especially given the inapplicability of the Bill of Rights to tribes. Unfortunately, as with many tribal governance functions that ostensibly are preserved under federal law, this promise turns out to be more real in theory than in practice. On the one hand, **tribes** and individual Indians **have historically been forcibly disarmed** and otherwise denied the right to bear arms (and sometimes literally the right to defend themselves) **by the U.S. government**, as well as by individual colonies and states.3 At the same time, **most tribes have a long cultural tradition of hunting.** Moreover, **many tribes not only continue to view hunting as an important cultural practice, but also exercise a treaty right to hunt on reservation**, and, in some parts of the country, off reservation as well.5 **Because of the centrality of hunting to many tribal cultures, guns play an important role in some tribes irrespective of their usefulness for self-defense.**

3) Tribes have relied on guns to deter violence that plagues reservations.

**Twedy:** Ann TwedyAssociate Professor. Hamline University School of Law; “INDIAN TRIBES AND GUN REGULATION: SHOULD TRIBES EXERCISE THEIR SOVEREIGN RIGHTS TO ENACT GUN BANS OR STAND-YOUR-GROUND LAWS?”; <http://www.albanylawreview.org/Articles/Vol78_2/78.2.885%20Tweedy.pdf>; Accessed 3/30/16; published 3/11/15; PE

 **Finally, many Indian reservations are plagued by violent crime,** much of which has historically gone unpunished, although there is evidence that the federal government is finally stepping up its efforts to meaningfully respond to on- reservation crime.7 **One rational response to widespread, historically unpunished violent crime is to advocate for**—or, in this case, facilitate—**greater armament among the citizenry**.8 **Thus, given that Indians’ right to bear arms has historically been infringed, that tribal hunters usually rely on guns, and that many reservations are plagued by epidemic levels of violence, tribes have ample reason to want to protect the right to bear arms on their reservations. And, as will be discussed below, several tribes have elected to protect the right to bear arms.**

# Counter Plan 3

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

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

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

Class analysis resolves the case better than the AC’s anti-ethical stance. **Cole**

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

What then are the implications for educational practice? Preston’s pedagogical solutions are the abolition of both ‘whiteness’ and capitalism, of which the former, according to Preston, is perhaps capitalism’s ‘weakest link’ (2010, 123). **There are** three **major problems with ‘the abolition of whiteness’**. First **it is too vague to have any practical implications** (hardly surprising given the abstract theorizing that preceded its announcement).12 Just **how are white people to be persuaded to ‘abolish their whiteness’**, and **what would follow** such abolition? Second, given its vagueness, **it is** seriously **open to misinterpretation.** While Preston clearly does not propose the abolition of white people, his advocacy of the abolition of ‘whiteness’ is clearly open to being interpreted as such. Third, and following on from the first and second problems, the **abolition of ‘whiteness’ is useless as a** **unifier and counter-productive as a** political **rallying point**. Indeed, **were the abolition of whiteness to be** routinely **promoted in educational establishments, it would** most likely **cause severe confusion** and indeed mayhem. **Unproductive divisions** on grounds of ‘race’, class and culture **would** undoubtedly **accelerate**.13 As far as the abolition of capitalism is concerned, by its very nature, **abstract** academic **Marxism**, as developed by Postone and **not linked to practice, is not appropriate for** Marxist **pedagogy**. Rather the urgent need is to partake in Marxist **praxis**. This **must entail a concrete engagement** **with the real** **possibilities of** twenty-first-century **socialism** (for example, Lebowitz 2006; Martinez, Fox, and Farrell 2010; Motta and Cole 2013, **forthcoming**). **Rather than abolish ‘whiteness’**, however perceived, **it is more appropriate to unite around a common purpose.** **Central should be** a **theoretical exploration** of the concept of participatory democracy, but **linked to concrete practice**, such as in the communal councils and communes of Venezuela – a country where people are directly involved in decision-making and where Marxism, in the form of twenty-first-century socialism, is being considered seriously as a viable alternative to capitalism.1CAP DA:

Even if cap isn’t collapsing right now, any risk the aff makes it worse outweighs. We only have 20 years before cap kills us all. **Street** 16: Kill King Capital by PAUL STREET, FEBRUARY 9, 2016, <http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/02/09/kill-king-capital/>

**Capitalism**, by all indications, **is hard-wired to destroy decent life on Earth** in the not so distant future. **Humanity has perhaps 20 years, ma**ybe less, **to move off fossil fuels a**nd onto renewable sources or it will ruin all prospects for a decent future. **This is not merely the judgment of apocalyptic cranks and “catastrophist” worry warts. It is the** consensus **finding of a vast scientific literature on the** **environmental cataclysm that is certain to take hold in coming decades** and centuries if **Homo sapiens does not get off fossil fuels.** For many years now, the preponderant majority of earth and climate scientists have been telling us that the planet we all share is being made progressively uninhabitable for human and other sentient beings (and living things) by capitalism’s relentlessly wasteful, growth- and profit-addicted burning of fossil fuels.

Militarism Impact
Cap is the root of militarism. No aff solvency. **AW 08** – Anarchist Writers, “D.8 What causes militarism and what are its effects?”<http://anarchism.pageabode.com/afaq/secD8.html>

Firstly**,** there is the need to contain the domestic enemy - the oppressed and exploited sections of the population. As Emma Goldman argued, **the military machine***"is not directed only against the external enemy; it* ***aims much more at the internal enemy****.* ***It concerns that element of labour*** *which has learned not to hope for anything from our institutions, that awakened part of the working people which has realised that the war of classes underlies all wars among nations, and that if war is justified at all it is the war against economic dependence and political slavery,* ***the two dominant issues involved in the struggle of the classes****."* In other words, the nation *"which is to be protected by a huge military force is not"* that*"of the people, but that of the privileged class; the class which robs and exploits the masses, and controls their lives from the cradle to the grave."* [**Red Emma Speaks**, p. 352 and p. 348] The second, as noted in the section on imperialism, is that a strong military is necessary in order for a ruling class to pursue an aggressive and expansionist foreign policy in order to defend its interests globally. For most developed capitalist nations, this kind of foreign policy becomes more and more important because of economic forces, i.e. in order to provide outlets for its goods and capital to prevent the system from collapsing by expanding the market continually outward. This outward expansion of, and so competition between, capital needs military force to protect its interests (particularly those invested in other countries) and give it added clout in the economic jungle of the world market. This need has resulted in, for example, *"hundreds of US bases [being] placed all over the world to ensure global domination."* [Chomsky, **Failed States**, p. 11] The third major reason for **militarism** is to **bolster a state's economy. Capitalist militarism promotes the development of a specially favoured group of companies** which includes *"all those engaged in the manufacture and sale of munitions and in* ***military equipment for personal gain and profit****."* [Goldman, **Op. Cit.**, p. 354] These armaments companies ("defence" contractors) have a direct interest in the maximum expansion of military production. Since this group is particularly wealthy, it exerts great pressure on government to pursue the type of state intervention and, often, the aggressive foreign policies it wants. As Chomsky noted with respect to the US invasion and occupation of Iraq:

# Frontlines:

## Offense to flash them CP 2

1) And empirics prove the aff is good—Federal government policy can aid tribal autonomy

Cornell and Kalt ’10 (November, Stephen (University of Arizona) and Joseph P. (Harvard University) “American Indian Self-Determination: The Political Economy of a Successful Policy” JOPNA Discussion Papers for Peer Review and Comment http://nni.arizona.edu/pubs/jopna-wp1\_cornell&kalt.pdf)

The public policy effect of the federal policy of self-determination for federally recognized American Indian tribes has not only been greater control for tribal citizens and their governments over the management of tribal affairs, but greater control over the institutions of governance—all with the attendant overriding goal of better meeting the federal government’s interest in and obligations to the promotion and ensuring of tribal socio-economic development and well-being.48 In short, federal policy has been aimed specifically at placing tribal governments in the capacity previously occupied by the federal government, i.e., as the agent by which tribal citizens can choose, design, implement, and enforce those policies and functions deemed necessary to create an environment in which public affairs and private commerce can flourish. As we have seen, while problems remain and legacies of past social and economic stress are prominent, policies of self-determination have spurred development progress in Indian Country.

2) Indigenous populations were given guns by Westerners to fight their own kind. This way they would be vulnerable to colonization. **Riley 4:** Angela R. Riley Professor of Law at UCLA; “Indians and Guns”; [**http://georgetownlawjournal.org/files/2012/06/Riley.pdf**](http://georgetownlawjournal.org/files/2012/06/Riley.pdf); 2012 PE

Almost from the **first point of contact between Europeans and Indians, Indians have had guns**. They acquired them slowly, at first. **The trade of goods for food** and survival skills **in the New World** sustained colonizers initially.41 Tribes used these resources as a weighty bargaining tool in the early colonial period. Edmund Morgan describes how colonizers at Jamestown in 1609–1610 were starving during a brutal winter and survived only by obtaining corn from the local Indians.42 Thus was born a “symbiotic relations[hip] of interdependence with Indians . . . involving both conflict and cooperation, that formed the matrix of modern American society.”43 **Despite European ambivalence about the exchange of firearms with the Native population, the gun trade grew** from embryonic to thriving **in** only a few **decades**. Guns for trade were readily available and increasingly served as an integral part of market dynamics in early America.44 **“By the beginning of the seventeenth century the gun had become an institution in America and there were definite patterns of procedures in procuring and distributing arms and ammunition.”45 And Indians, of course, wanted guns. Not only was the new technology viewed with “wonder,”46 but a supply of guns and ammunition made it possible for tribes to hunt with more efficiency, producing more furs and pelts with which to trade. Guns thus catapulted the Indian into the market economy, creat[ed]ing a dynamic relationship between Indians and whites that set the stage for the settlement of the West.47 Of course, guns** were also desired because they **allowed Indians to maintain a distinct advantage over** disputes with **enemy tribes**.48 After all, tribes did not have a unified Indian identity prior to contact. To the contrary, **tribes** had formed strategic alliances with other tribal nations but also **engaged in bitter wars over territory and resources**, with hostilities sometimes extending over hundreds of years. With the introduction of firearms, guns in the hands of one tribe gave it a powerful advantage over its historical enemies and, in many instances, increased deadly battles.49 Thus, in the fledgling new world, **guns represented “access to power”** for both Indians and **whites playing a critical role in establishing victors and serving as the weapon of choice for Europeans seeking to conquer indigenous populations.**

## AT: Above Offense

On Kornell and Cot:

1. T/ Aid is already given to Indians but your aff literally forces them to implement the aff.
2. This is just an unwarranted claim that development is spurred. It gives no empirical examples.

On Riley:

1) T/ Okay handguns have historically oppressed them but that means it is their decision to ban handguns USFG forcing them just reentrenches us in the same oppression.